

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARIA RUTENBURG,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
TWITTER, INC.,  
Defendant.

Case No. 4:21-cv-00548-YGR

**ORDER DENYING SECOND MOTION FOR  
LEAVE TO FILE SECOND AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

Re: Dkt. No. 27

The Court previously dismissed this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction (Dkt. No. 21), denied plaintiff Maria Rutenburg's first motion for leave to file a second amended complaint (Dkt. No. 25), and subsequently entered judgment in this action. (Dkt. No. 26.) Now before the Court is Rutenburg's second motion for leave to file a second amended complaint, filed post judgment. (Dkt. No. 27.) Having reviewed the motion as well as the docket of this action, the second motion for leave to file a second amended complaint is **DENIED**.

Rutenburg's second motion is nothing more than an improper motion for reconsideration of the Court's earlier decisions. (*See* N.D. Cal. L.R. 7-9.) Specifically, Rutenburg does not demonstrate any (1) material difference now in fact or law, (2) the emergence of new material facts or a change in law occurring after the time of the orders, or (3) a manifest failure of the Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments which were previously presented. The second motion is otherwise appropriately denied under the grounds and reasoning previously articulated by the Court in the prior orders. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 21, 25.)

Accordingly, the second motion for leave to file a second amended complaint is **DENIED**.

This Order terminates Docket Number 27.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 22, 2021

  
YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE